

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 93 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #388
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 23 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 388

Today's Topics:

FCC Rulebook
Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?
Inflation (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 93 01:13:26 EDT
From: news.moneng.mei.com!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!
mystis!dan@uunet.uu.net
Subject: FCC Rulebook
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greg Law <GREGL@delphi.com> writes:

> For what it's worth, I think a COMPLETE copy of the FCC Rules and Regulations
> should be required before getting a license -- or at least a complete copy
> embedded in every study guide. I can't stress highly enough the importance
> of reading, and understanding the FCC Rules and Regulations. When you receive
> your license, you sign it stating that you will abide by Part 97. I questions
> anyone that doesn't have a copy how they intend to abide by the rules when
> they have no clue what's in Part 97.
>
> Nope. . . the question pools cover very little of Part 97.
>
> -- Greg KE4DPX

Ahmen!

When ever a friend of mine gets his license I try and give him a copy of part 97 (W5YI version ?). Because of that very reason. Maybe the tests should cover less about frequency alocation and more about operating procedures.

```
Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV  |<=====|  "An Elephant:  A Mouse, built to
N8PKV@mystis.wariat.org |From All|      government specifications."
dan@mystis.wariat.org   | of Us   |      -L. Long
dan@amcomp.wariat.org   |<=====|
```

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 93 01:02:49 EDT
From: spool.mu.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greg Law <GREGL@delphi.com> writes:

[Some deleted]

```
> I agree with the statement to some degree. The Technician class operators
> that upgrade to General or higher without prior knowledge of the sespool
> frequencies in the HF bands may be in for a rude awakening. I can't say
> that I've heard such rudeness and foul language in the Novice portions of
> the HF bands. On the other hand, I've rarely heard such trash in the 2M
> band.
>
> Only once have I heard real rudeness on the 2M band in my area. Not so
> surprising, a local General or higher class operator got totally polluted
> (and I mean royally drunk) and decided to put in his two cents about
> Technician operators -- and then proceeded to step on everyone that attempted
> to talk. Of course he showed his own stupidity because everyone on the air
> at the time QSY'd to another repeater and left the poor jerk high and dry.
>
> Overall, the local guys are very curteous and helpful. The only time I run
> into riff-raff on a regular basis are on the HF bands and here.
>
> -- Greg KE4DPX
```

The you go! The best way to clean up HF is to NOT allow anyone with a code speed higher than 5 WPM on HF! Seems No-Coder's make better operators. The code testing seems to insure "trash" operations.

--... ..-- --...--

-... . -. ---.. ---. -.--

(NoCoders: Please forgive the Morse comments.)

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV |<=====| "An Elephant: A Mouse, built to
N8PKV@mystis.wariat.org |From All| government specifications."
dan@mystis.wariat.org | of Us | -L. Long
dan@amcomp.wariat.org |<=====|

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1993 15:08:21 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!sgiblab!news.kpc.com!amd!netcomsv!netcom.com!
stevev@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Inflation
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <qF9oBc2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, robert@amanda.jpunix.com (Robert)
writes:

> > that this corresponds to annual inflation of 7.2%.
> >
> > In 1968, it cost 5c to mail a letter locally. It now costs 29c, this
> > corresponds to an inflation rate of 7.3%.
> >
> > So tell us again what your point is?
>
> Please, don't compare the Post Office with the ARRL. The Postal System is
> a for-profit venture, whereas the League is non-profit, staffed by
> volunteers. I guess the next thing you'll tell me is that the HQ Staff is
> paid a salary!
>
> --Robert

I may be humor impaired here....um...uh....the league staff is
compensated with green backs for their service. That isn't to
say that the amount received is comensurate with the abuse
received from this community...but they are paid for their efforts.

As for what it costs to be a member...I don't care...I'm a lifer ;-)

Steve KA6S

Date: 22 Oct 93 09:33:56
From: korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!
appserv.Eng.Sun.COM!appserv!rfm@ames.arpa
Subject: Inflation
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Oct21.015316.23739@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev.
Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>I'm all in favor of giving Ed a raise, so he can buy some new
>clothes, and, more importantly, a microphone for his mobile HF
>station.

So he can send CW with the PTT switch?

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 21 Oct 1993 20:39:07 GMT
From: wupost!news.miami.edu!usenet.ufl.edu!suntan.eng.usf.edu!
cfrrisc1.cfr.usf.edu!knupke@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <29k3p3\$8uj@cayman.Cayman.COM>, <931019.85430.GREGL@delphi.com>,
<2a6lnd\$svf@news.acns.nwu.edu>f
Subject : Re: Getting my license. Do I want to be like this?

As a amateur operator who started as a Codeless technician who has recently
come to really enjoy operating, code It is obvious the those who have no
exposure to code are missing a part of the hobby.

The one aspect of operating cw that has really grown on me is the fact I
can ragchew in peace without many folks jumping in on me.

I am only able to use the novice bands as my code is not fast enough to
pass the 13wpm yet but I am working on it. I have had several QSO's on
CW that have been over an hour and I really enjoyed conversing even at
my speed of ~7-9 wpm. Its slow but it gets the job done.

73 de Paul - KD4VMD - Tampa, FL - University of South Florida
knupke@cfrrisc1.cfr.usf.edu * 1:377/61@fidonet * KD4VMD@WA1GUD.#TPA.FL.USA.NA

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 1993 21:49:40 GMT

From: spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csli!
paulf@decwrl.dec.com

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.930ct18145414@tooltalk.eng.sun.com>,

<19930ct19.002548.24024@Csli.Stanford.EDU>, <RFM.930ct20102721@urth.eng.sun.com>

Subject : Re: CB instead of a no-code HF ham license?

rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>> Secondly, since we're talking QRP

>>here, CW is actually useful given the lower noise bandwidth.

>Irrelevant. The fun here is building it and having it work *at all*, not
>how many 599's I can get.

Well, if you don't care about actually *talking* to someone else, why not
just build the transmitter of your dreams, and operate into a dummy load?

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 1993 02:02:52 GMT

From: news.kpc.com!amd!netcomsv!netcom.com!jfh@decwrl.dec.com

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2a51lq\$ai9@crcnis1.unl.edu>, <2a660b\$97g@reznor.larc.nasa.gov>,
<gregCF9ApD.GrE@netcom.com>

Subject : Re: GAY & QST

greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) wrote:

>What follows is the text of email received from David Sumner K1ZZ,

>the Executive Vice-President of the ARRL, in response to my challenge

>for the ARRL to make some official statement regarding the dispute

>between themselves and LARC.

It's good to know that our discussions on this topic (and presumably
others) are being read by people at the ARRL.

>The following is posted with the author's

>permission. I will reserve my own comments for a later post, so that

>Mr. Sumner's statment may stand on its own.

>

>=====

>>Dear Greg:

>>

>>Ed Hare has passed along a recent message from you concerning

>>Lambda ARC and ARRL.

>>

>>I have not been following any of the discussion, so I cannot

>>comment on anything that might have been said by others.

>>

>>The situation is this. In early April 1992, in plenty of time

>>for the ad to appear in June 1992 QST, I advised LARC president

>>Jim Kelly that the ad as most recently submitted was acceptable

>>for QST. That it did not appear in that issue, nor in any

>>subsequent issue, is entirely his choice.

>>

>>73,

>>David Sumner, K1ZZ

>>Executive Vice President, ARRL

I received a similar letter from Mr. Sumner. What he said doesn't necessarily contradict what the gentleman from LARC said.

If I were LARC, I'd take Mr. Sumner up on his offer. LARC could compromise slightly on their principles and get the ad published and the lawsuit over with, and that wouldn't eliminate the possibility of the ARRL changing their other policies (such as the definition of "family" for the membership rate) later. But I'm a pragmatist, and I understand that not everyone else is - and sometimes it is better to dig in and take a stand. I have the impression, though, that the two sides have locked themselves into a deadly embrace.

--

Jack Hamilton POB 281107 SF CA 94128 USA
jfh@netcom.com kd6ttl@w6pw.#nocal.ca.us.na

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #388
